

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

---

**EX PARTE Thomas**

---

**Application for Patent**

**Filed September 5, 2000**

**Serial No. 09/655,273**

**Group Art Unit 2165**

**Examiner: AL HASHEMI, Sana A.**

**FOR:**

**METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR PROVIDING AND UPDATING  
ON-LINE FORMS AND REGISTRATIONS**

---

**REPLY BRIEF**

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

This Reply Brief is responsive to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 10, 2010. The Grounds of Rejection in section (9) at pages 3-6 of the Examiner's Answer are the same as the rejection in the final Office Action of July 6, 2009. Hence, the following remarks and/or arguments are responsive to the Response to Argument in section (10) at pages 6-10 of the Examiner's Answer.

**A. Neither Freivald nor Glogau teach or suggest a copyright registration update of any sort**

At page 6, the Examiner asserts that "Freivald in view of Glogau disclose the change detection tool which detect any changes to the ... document and update the document as shown (Col. 2, lines 8-21, and lines 56-63, Freivald)."

Appellant respectfully disagrees. Neither Freivald nor Glogau teach any ability, need or desire to determine whether a copyright registration update is needed. The Examiner's assertions to the contrary are not supported by the record.

**B. Examiner has not made out a *Prima Facie* rejection for claim 24**

At pages 6 and 7, the Examiner asserts (in essence) that claim 24 was properly rejected. However, the Examiner attempts newly supports this rejection at page 7, lines 3-9. These *new* reasons for support of the rejection of claim 24 are not supported by the references. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion for anything akin to "a prior copyright registration", "storing prior registration information" or "update registration information automatically being based at least in part on the prior registration information pertaining to the prior copyright registration of the website" as recited in claim 24. Still further, these new grounds are not timely and should not be permitted to support a previously issued final rejection.

C. **Examiner has not made out a *Prima Facie* rejection for claim 24**

At pages 7-10, the Examiner comments on other argument of the Appeal Brief. These arguments in the Examiner's Answer are essentially as argued in the Final Rejection and have been fully debunked in the Appeal Brief, thus no further discussion is needed.

II. **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons set forth in the Appeal Brief and this Reply Brief, the Board should reverse the Final Rejection and should order the Examiner to pass this application to allowance.

If any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this Appeal Brief, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 504298 (Order No. CDP006).

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Douglass Thomas/

C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

TI Law Group  
2055 Junction Ave., Suite 205  
Cupertino, CA 95131  
408-955-0535